

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated January 7, 2010 (and subsequent Examiner's Answer on Appeal), and the references cited therein, have been considered. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7-15 were previously pending and the basis for a currently pending appeal to which the presently filed RCE and accompanying amendment apply. No claims currently stand allowed.

Applicants have amended the claims to more precisely distinguish the claimed invention from the combined teachings of prior art *in at least two ways*. *First*, the claims have been amended to recite that row and column buffer amplifiers synchronously operate under time-division multiplexed control to carry out mutually exclusive functions of touch sensing and pixel value setting. *See, e.g.*, PCT Pub. WO 2005/008462 A3 (Applicants' specification and drawings), FIG. 4 and page 10, line 31 to page 11, line 12. In contrast, Geaghan discloses a circuit wherein touch sensing and pixel value setting are achieved by modulating the sense signal on the pixel driver signal on a continuous basis. *See*, Geaghan, FIG. 5A (referenced previously by the Examiner's Answer, page 13).

Additional dependent claims 16-18 have been added that are directed to particular circuitry for carrying out the above-mentioned time-division multiplexed control. Support for the new dependent claims is provided, for example, in FIG. 4 and the corresponding written description at page 10, line 31 to page 11, line 12 of Applicants' specification and drawings.

Second, the claims have been amended (clarified in the case of claim 11) to recite that at least one of the row buffer amplifier and column buffer amplifier operates as a touch sensor signal receiver. Claim 11, which previously recited this element, has been clarified in the presently submitted set of amended claims. Applicants first note that, with regard to the Final Office Action's basis for rejecting claim 11, the column buffer amplifier 311 (Applicants FIG. 3 "AAPA") is not a "sense amplifier." Rather amplifier 311 is a *driver* (source) of a signal on *the second conductor* – i.e., the signal is not being received from the second conductor. Moreover, Applicants further note that the Final Office Action relies in part upon Geaghan to reject claim 11 (the dual use buffer aspect). However, Geaghan's signal modulation approach (*see, e.g.*, Geaghan, FIG. 5A), like AAPA, does not appear to be amenable to use in claim 11's recited circuit wherein at least one of the row/column buffer amplifiers operates as a touch sensor *signal*

receiver. For at least this additional reason claims 11-14 (and new independent claim 21) are patentable over the prior art.

The above-discussed "touch sensor signal receiver" element is incorporated into new independent claim 21 and claims 19 and 20 that depend from claim 11. Support for these amendments is provided, for example, in FIG. 4 and page 11, line 13 to page 12, line 3 of Applicants' specification and drawings.

Applicants request favorable reconsideration of the previous grounds for rejecting the previously pending claims, in view of Applicants' amendments and remarks herein above. Please charge any fee deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 12-1216.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Joy, Reg. No. 35,562
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: February 15, 2011